

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | F       | LING DATE      | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|------------------|---------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/429,522       |         | 10/28/1999     | PETER C. BAHRS       | AUS990339US3        | 6039             |
| 35525            | 7590    | 02/23/2004     |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
| DUKE W. Y        | 'EE     |                |                      | PAULA,              | CESAR B          |
| CARSTENS,        | YEE & ( | CAHOON, L.L.P. |                      |                     |                  |
| P.O. BOX 80      | 2334    |                | ART UNIT             | PAPER NUMBER        |                  |
| DALLAS, TX 75380 |         |                |                      | 2178                |                  |

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   | Application No.  | Applicant(s)  |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| Advisory Action   | 09/429,522   | BAHRS ET AL.  |  |
| , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,   | Examiner   | Art Unit  |  |
|   | CESAR B PAULA  | 2178  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | ars on the cover sheet with the c  | orrespondence add                                   | ress                                   |
| THE REPLY FILED 26 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.   | oid abandonment of this applica<br>a timely filed amendment which  | ation. A proper reply<br>n places the applica       | y to a<br>tion in                      |
| PERIOD FOR RE   | PLY [check either a) or b)]  |   |  |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing  | g date of the final rejection                       | on.                                    |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of t (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C | f extension and the corresponding amo<br>the shortened statutory period for reply<br>be later than three months after the mail | unt of the fee. The approriginally set in the final | opriate extension<br>Office action; or |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR  | •  |   |  |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be   | ecause:  |   |  |
| (a) they raise new issues that would require furthe   | er consideration and/or search (s  | see NOTE below);                                    |  |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be   | elow);   |   |  |
| <ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in<br/>issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>  | n better form for appeal by mate<br>· .  | rially reducing or sir                              | nplifying the                          |
| <ul><li>(d) they present additional claims without canceling</li><li>NOTE:</li></ul>  | ng a corresponding number of fi  | nally rejected claims                               | S.                                     |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti   | ion(s):  |   |  |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).   | be allowable if submitted in a se  | parate, timely filed                                | amendment                              |
| 5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: <u>See</u>  |  | dered but does NO                                   | T place the                            |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.   | ause it is not directed SOLELY to  | o issues which were                                 | e newly                                |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment (explanation of how the new or amended claims wo  |  |   | and an                                 |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |  |   |  |
| Claim(s) allowed:   |  |   |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:   |  |   |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>64-75 and 77-82</u> .   |  |   |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |  | AT  | - [                                    |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appropriate the attached Information Disclosure Statemen   | oved or b) disapproved by the  | ne Examiner. 🔏 🎉                                    | ulh                                    |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen  | it(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)   |   | •                                      |
| 10. Other:  |  |   | HENS. HONG<br>RY EXAMINER              |
|   |  |   |  |





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The objections due to informalities in claims 66-68, and 79-81, have been withdrawn in view of the explanation that the objected informalities were not found originally in the faxed amendment (8/5/03, p.6,L.7-12). It seems that due to the poor quality of the fax transmission, strikethroughs did not show up in the fax received by the office, thereby introducing apparent errors into the received fax amendment.

However, the withdrawal of the claims above, does not affect the rejections of claims 64-75, and 77-82, which still remain.

The submitted IDS cannot be considered at this time, in accordance with 37 CFR 1.97©, since prosecution is closed.